

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
ABERDEEN DIVISION**

**JAMES CURRY, JR.**

**PLAINTIFF**

**v.**

**No. 1:20CV176-DAS**

**LEE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER JAIL**

**DEFENDANT**

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTIONS [47], [57], [58], [61], [66] TO AMEND COMPLAINT**

This matter comes before the court on the motions [47], [57], [58], [61], [66] by the plaintiff to amend his complaint. A “court should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)). Although not automatic, the decision to grant or deny such leave is within the sound discretion of the district court. *Bloom v. Bexar County, Texas*, 130 F.3d 722, 727 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997), *Halbert v. City of Sherman*, 33 F.3d 526, 529 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994). The defendants have already answered the plaintiff’s complaint, and adding new allegations and a plethora of additional defendants would prejudice the defense in this case. In addition, most of the proposed amendments are merely exhibits, which the plaintiff may offer as evidence at a trial or hearing on this matter. For these reasons, the plaintiff’s motions [47], [57], [58], [61], [66] to amend are not well taken and are **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this, the 17th day of March, 2022.

/s/ David A. Sanders  
DAVID A. SANDERS  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE